

### **REMARKS**

After entry of the present amendment, claims 1-6, 10, and 13 will be pending. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 4 and 5. Specifically,  $R^1$ - $R^2$  has been limited to (a-5),  $R^3$  has been limited to halo, and  $R^4$  has been limited to halo. Claims 9, 11, and 12 have been canceled. The Applicants expressly reserve the right to file the subject matter of the canceled claims in one or more continuing or divisional applications.

The Applicants thank Examiner Chang for the courtesy of conducting a telephonic interview with the Applicants' representatives on May 4, 2009. All claims were discussed in view of the cited art.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office has withdrawn the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. 6,544,997 in view of US 4,186,135 for claims 4 and 5. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 4 and 5. As all pending claims incorporate the limitations of amended claim 1, the Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, and 10 be withdrawn.

#### **Rejoinder and allowability of claim 13**

The Office has advised that claim 13 would be allowable if limited to the allowable scope of claims 4 and 5. In view of the amended claims, Applicants submit claim 13 in now in condition for allowance.

#### **Obviousness-type double patenting**

In view of the present claim amendments and the comparative data set forth in the specification at page 54, the Applications respectfully request that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection over US 6,544,997 in view of U.S. 4,186,135 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, and 13 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over U.S. App. No. 10/560,555, now U.S. 7,498,347. While not conceding the propriety of the rejection, a terminal disclaimer over U.S. 7,498,347 is submitted herewith to obviate the rejection over that patent.

**DOCKET NO.:** JANM-0764/PRD2060USPCT  
**Application No.:** 10/560,485  
**Office Action Dated:** April 9, 2009

**PATENT**

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, and 13 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over U.S. App. No. 10/560,479. U.S. App. No. 10/560,479 has not issued or been allowed and is not earlier-filed to the present application. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application should be allowed to issue as a patent without a terminal disclaimer over U.S. App. No. 10/560,479. The necessity of a terminal disclaimer may be considered once allowable subject matter is confirmed in the respective applications.

### **Conclusion**

The Applicants assert that the foregoing constitutes a full and complete response to the April 9, 2009 Office Action and that claims 1-3, 6, 10, and 13 are in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Date: June 3, 2009

/Stephanie A. Barbosa/  
Stephanie A. Barbosa  
Registration No. 51,430

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439